URBAN CORE SPECIFIC PLAN

Advisory Committee - August 13, 2004



Charrette Summary - Day 2

Mark Brodeur reviewed the proposed agenda for the day which kicked off with presentations from Economic Research Associates and Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. regarding marketing/economics and traffic/transportation, respectively.

William Anderson with Economic Research Associates provided a summary of the urban core market context. The economic overview provided information on the regional economy including per capita and household income and employment trends. The local and regional demographic profiles and trends were described including population, age distribution, race and ethnicity, as well as retail sales trends and real estate characteristics. Mr. Anderson expanded on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and trends (SWOT) for the study area. Further market and economic analysis is part of the Urban Core Specific Plan work program to help further define project goals and parameters as well as project feasibility and implementation strategies.

Dave Sorenson with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. provided an overview of urban mobility concepts being considered under the General Plan update as relevant to the urban core. Transit and pedestrian oriented development issues were also summarized. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) will provide preemption devices for busses to use at intersections to reduce route times. Also, proposed development density and mixed use should be placed where the transit opportunities are. The Urban Core Specific Plan area will have multiple urban arterials. Grade separations will likely be implemented at E Street and H Street. A cover over portions of the San Diego Freeway is also being pursued. Pedestrian orientation can be encouraged by providing wide sidewalks (10 to 12 feet preferred), placing building facades close to the street, and separating parking from pedestrian areas. Potential funding sources for implementation of needed improvements was also discussed including TDIF (Transportation Development Impact Fee). Plan characteristics will make the project more desirable and competitive for funding. TransNet regional funding may be available for grade separations.

The next portion of the meeting provided a visual overview of each of the nine focus districts with a number of images ranging in height and massing. Images shown also included a variety of streetscape scenarios. Committee members were asked to rank images as appropriate, neutral or inappropriate. Follow this link for highlights of survey results that provide the top and bottom-rated images for each district. [insert CPS results link]



Both Advisory Committee members and members of the public were invited to write issues, concerns and "big ideas" on the six banners provided, particularly for comments that may not have been shared already. Banner headings included Circulation/Transit, Land Use, Community Design, Parks and Services, Implementation and Other Key Issues. The following comments were provided:

Land Use

- Increase "green" areas/landscaping
- More pepper trees and palm trees on streets using center divider
- Market structure/E Street trolley with connection to F Street corridor
- Create district opportunities, i.e., arts, theaters
- Mind the relationship between land uses
- Create memorable spaces and volumes

Community Design

- Widen sidewalks on 3rd Avenue / reduce auto traffic to one lane each direction
- · Wider sidewalks/greenscape
- Street frontage enhancements
- Modern look/break monotony
- Nostalgia and history SELL. People visit most European cities to see what WAS.
- Need to preserve Chula Vista's historic character
- Look for excellence get great examples
- Design is more important than density
- You can't recreate history without becoming Disneyland
- Design should be honest, TODAY, eclectic on 3rd Avenue/ lower-scale areas. Classic in higher-scale areas (i.e., H Street)
- "Bigger" is not always "better" make Chula Vista better, not just bigger design-wise

Parks and Services

- Create a "lake" (saltwater?) similar to Eastlake where people could fish
- Create pedestrian plazas connected by paseos connected throughout
- Walking trails/parks
- Maximize green wherever and whenever possible
- Landscape the medias at 3rd Avenue and D Street and at the 3rd and Seavale triangle
- Paseos should connect all districts
- Make "ramblas" park-like boulevards
- Create shade

Circulation/Transit

- Turn Downtown (specifically 3rd Avenue) into a "promenade" with no vehicles/traffic allowed after 6 p.m. or before 6 a.m.
- One-way roads on main streets to and from freeway
- Trolley below grade
- Parking structures
- Reduce 3rd Avenue lane widths
- Remove/limit transit downtown only at nodes
- Break the grid "boulevards"

Implementation

- · As soon as possible
- Need to establish the uniqueness of Chula Vista
- Establish an arts and cultural area
- Millions of people travel I-5 and I-805 divert some into Chula Vista as a tourist destination

Other Key Issues

- Incorporate 3rd Avenue extension and north 4th Avenue to 54 in the plan
- Pedestrian friendly and landscape wise
- North 4th Ave. is the HISTORIC GATEWAY to City
- Make Chula Vista a focal point of San Diego County
- Transit villages connect to Downtown/Bayfront
- Seriously consider negotiating with National City to create a clean northern border with the flood control channel/54 it's really hard to have two cities' jurisdictions facing each other from opposite sides of the street on OUR historic gateway
- Don't forget to plan in terms of the potential ecotourism as huge draw for our city

Before conclusion of the meeting, Advisory Committee members were asked to provide slides to augment building images provided in the Visual Preference Survey. Four slides were requested of each member to be forwarded to Mary Ladiana. The immediate next step in the project process is to conduct a public workshop, scheduled for September 13, 2004, where the Visual Preference Survey will be conducted for interested members of the public.